





**S P E E C H**

OF

**J U D G E K E L L E Y ;**

DELIVERED AT

**SPRING GARDEN HALL,**

**TUESDAY EVENING,**

**SEPTEMBER 16, 1856.**

---

**PHILADELPHIA :**

**KING & BAIRD, PRINTERS, No. 9 SANSOM STREET.**

**1856.**



# JUDGE KELLEY'S SPEECH,

AT SPRING GARDEN HALL, SEPTEMBER 16, 1856.

Have you heard the news from Maine, boys? (Great applause.) Such were the words with which I commenced an address to the friends of Polk, Dallas, and Shunk, in 1844, about this season of the year, in the district of Spring Garden; and the Democratic news that had come that day,—the day succeeding a gubernatorial and congressional election—was esteemed as the sure presage of victory to the party, as we esteem the news to-day. (Cheers.)

We live in curious times, politically, my friends. Why is it that the Democratic star of the East, and the young Democratic Giant of the West, have wheeled into line and put themselves on either side of the Whig Gibraltar, Vermont? Why stand Democratic Maine and Iowa supporting Whig Vermont? There is a significance in the fact. It tells, to those who understand it, the whole secret of the uprising of the people which has made a party (so far as Pennsylvania is concerned but a few weeks old,) the master of the destinies of the Commonwealth, and the party to settle the coming national election. (Immense applause.)

The Whigs of old and the Democrats of old, however they differed upon other questions, agreed upon one;—indeed, their agreement was so entire that no question was made upon that subject. They differed as to a National Bank; they differed as to Tariff; they differed as to the distribution of the public lands; they differed as to the improvement of rivers and harbors by the General Government; but they agreed as the patriots who framed the Constitution and who gave our government consistency by the earliest action under it—they agreed between themselves, and with the great men who had moved before them, that slavery was a local domestic State institution; that, being such, the General Government had no concern with it within the limits of any one of the States. They agreed, in esteeming it a great social and political evil. They held that the Territories, being the common property of the States and of the people, and having been confined by the Constitution of the United States to Congress, (it having been made the duty of Congress to make all necessary regulations for the Territories,) it was the business of Congress to legislate for the Territories, and to exclude from them so great a social and political evil as Slavery. There was no diversity of opinion on this subject among those who achieved the freedom of our country. There was no diversity of opinion upon this subject among those who established the confederacy and governed the country during the existence of the confederation. There was no disagreement among the earlier members of

Congress during the administration of George Washington, or between that great man and the great men who made up his cabinets. I have stated the doctrine held by them all—that the States were sovereign and independent—that over the institutions of the States Congress had no control—that the Territories were the common property of the States, and that it was the duty of Congress to legislate for the Territories; and by all their actions they showed that they agreed in the opinion, that, it being the duty of Congress to legislate for the Territories, it was their duty to legislate in such a manner as should promote the welfare of the people, and, therefore, to exclude Slavery from the common domain. (Loud cheers.)

I shall not detain you by dwelling upon the circumstances of the great ordinance of 1787, which gave freedom to Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Wisconsin and Illinois. That Territory was the property of Virginia, a slave State, and, had no confederation taken place, no Union been framed, it would have been slave territory, as the mother State was. It was ceded, though in the southern portions of it were contained considerable numbers of slaves; especially in Illinois. It was ceded first to the confederacy, and subsequently to the United States; Thomas Jefferson himself drafted the ordinance by which "involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime," was prohibited from all that territory forever. That was the draft of the great Virginia Democratic statesman. Quibblers tell you that that was the action of the confederacy. I tell you that it was the action of the confederacy, and history tells you that the first Congress assembled under our Constitution made that the law of Congress which had been made the ordinance of the confederacy. It was re-enacted, in the very language of Jefferson, as the sixth section of the Act for the Government of the Northwestern Territory.

The territory ceded by North Carolina and by Kentucky, was ceded with stipulations, and Congress was not free to legislate beyond these stipulations; but there came a time when Congress was required to legislate for the territories, and it came speedily. We acquired the Louisiana territory. We bought it: Mr. Jefferson taking an active part in its purchase, he having succeeded Washington and Adams in the presidential chair. Now, what were the provisions for the government of that territory, thus acquired by purchase? It was slave territory. The French had admitted slavery into Louisiana; it had its existence there; money was invested in slavery; the habits of the people were adapted to slave-

labor. That territory, slave territory as it was, was acquired by purchase in 1803; and in 1804, Thomas Jefferson being President, the Congress of the United States legislated upon the subject. Did they legislate upon the subject of slavery in the territories—for, mark you, we are now called “traitors” and “disunionists,” because we assert the doctrine that it is the duty of Congress to legislate upon the subject or slavery in the territories. Upon that one proposition all the grave charges are based; and I propose to show you that if we are traitors and disunionists, our great exemplar was George Washington: that the next in rank and perhaps even greater in efficiency in this work, was Thomas Jefferson; that we have had in the treasonable and disunion ranks every president, beginning with Washington and ending with Millard Fillmore. If we are a set of traitors and disunionists, the first great set were Washington and his cabinet, and the Senate and Congress of his day; and the last who legislated especially upon the subject were James K. Polk with his cabinet, (of whom James Buchanan was one,) and the congress of their day; so that if we are traitors and disunionists, we have a brilliant example and a bright array of patriotic names to lead us on. (Great applause.)

But, my friends, if I were asked to sum up in a single phrase, from patriotic lips, the sentiment that prevades and controls the Republican party, I should utter it in the language of the Whig Expounder of the Constitution—“Liberty and Union, one and inseparable—now and forever.” (Immense enthusiasm.) If I were asked to express the one point upon which the opinions, the convictions, the will of that party are more thoroughly settled and more vehemently active than any other, I would answer in the language of the good old sage and statesman, the Democratic leader—Andrew Jackson—“the Union—it must and shall be preserved.” (Vociferous applause.)

Having, in brief terms, disposed of the first legislation on the subject of territories, I now come to that of the territory of Louisiana: the first acquired after the establishment of the Constitution of the United States. What was the action of Congress with reference to that territory? What was done may be found (United States Statutes at large, vol. 2, p. 283) in an Act approved March 26, 1804, entitled “*An act erecting Louisiana into two territories, and providing for the temporary government thereof.*”

By this Act, all south of the parallel line of 33 degrees, being the present State of Louisiana, was organised by itself under the name of the “*Territory of Orleans.*”

In respect to this Territory of Orleans, the 10th section prohibits the bringing in of slaves from a foreign country; also the bringing in of slaves from any part of the United States, who may have been brought into the United States after the 1st of May, 1798; and finally provides as follows:

“No slave or slaves, shall directly or indirectly be introduced into said territory, except

by a citizen of the United States, removing into said territory for actual settlement, and being at the time of such removal a *bona fide* owner of such slave or slaves; and every slave imported or brought into said territory, contrary to the provisions of this Act, shall thereupon be entitled to and receive his or her freedom.”

It is said that slavery is a subject upon which congress has no right to legislate. Here they did legislate, and said that nobody but a citizen of the United States should bring a slave there; that he must bring it as his own property, and be able to show that it was his property; that he must come for actual settlement—in other words, that no slave should be imported into that State, by the slavedealer, whether he came from Cuba or Virginia—whether he came from Africa or the northern slave States. It allowed the citizen who owned slaves and who was going into Louisiana to settle, to take his slaves with him: but it allowed no slave to enter the territory by any other means than that; and had a slave been taken into that territory as they have been taken into Kansas, the *habeas corpus* would have issued, and the great judge of that day, John Marshall, would have given the slave his freedom. (Applause.)

The law of that day is the law of to-day; and yet are not slaves carried into Kansas, and is there not there as Chief Justice a man whose infamies will redeem the character of Jeffries in history? (A voice—“that’s so,” and applause.) And yet, Democrats, you are asked to vote to sustain him; and, Americans, you are asked to give a half-vote, or not to vote against him. There is the position of the parties. The Republicans come up and say, “Kansas is free: it is the land of freedom; it is free by the law of God and the law of man, and being free, we mean to exercise all the power with which under God and the Constitution of our country we are invested, to secure its freedom to the white man forever.” (Tremendous cheering.) We ask you to join us in the work.

Now, my friends, from that time, down till near the close of Mr. Polk’s administration, any other doctrine than that which I have asserted, had never been uttered in either House of Congress. I take it that my Democratic friends will receive the opinions of James Buchanan as pretty sound, and I will quote from one of the last, if not the very last speech which he made while representing the State of Pennsylvania in the Senate of the United States. It was during the administration of John Tyler, when the “Texas bill” was under consideration. It was proposed to admit Texas into the Union, and it was agreed in the resolutions of the House, that so much of Texas as lay south of the line of 36 degrees 30 minutes, should be admitted as States when the people thereof saw fit to divide it, and ask admission to the Union; but that from so much of it as lay north of that line, slavery, or (to use the language of the ordinance of Jefferson) “involuntary servitude, except as

punishment for crime," should be prohibited forever. Mr. Buchanan was speaking upon those resolutions

"Was it desirable," said he, "again to have the Missouri question brought home to the people to goad them to fury?"

What was that Missouri question? When Congress had prohibited the extension of slavery north of 36 degrees 30 minutes, while the whole North had stood up almost as one man resisting—or at any rate when every man from the North, with a solitary exception, who had voted to give up one inch of territory to slavery North or South of that line had been left out of the succeeding Congress, the whole South had voted for it—every Southern Senator and all the Southern Representatives except 13—and it had been made. It was of that legislation, excluding slavery from all the Territories North of 36 degrees 30 minutes, that Mr. Buchanan was now speaking.

"Was it desirable," said he, "again to have the Missouri question brought home to the people, to goad them to fury? That question between the two great interests in our country had been well discussed and well decided, and from that moment he had set down his foot on the solid ground then established, and there he would let the question stand forever. Who could complain of the terms of that compromise?"

"It was then settled that North of 36 degrees 30 minutes, slavery should be forever prohibited. The same line was fixed upon in the resolutions recently received from the House of Representatives, now before us. The bill from the House for the establishment of Territorial government in Oregon excluded slavery altogether from that vast country."

Is our position treasonable? ("No, no.") Is it one calculated to promote disunion? If it is, James Buchanan was, I presume, of discreet age when he made that speech in the Senate of the United States, although, in regard to some of his speeches, it is said he was a boy when he made them, and therefore ought not to be held responsible. (Laughter.)

I have read that brief quotation to show you what the doctrine was when we were upon the threshold of the agitation that now disturbs the country. It was in 1845 that Mr. Buchanan made the speech from which I have quoted. On the 19th of February, 1847, John C. Calhoun arose in the Senate of the United States, and, without business before the Senate to which the resolutions referred, proposed these resolutions:

"Resolved, That the Territories of the United States belong to the several States composing the Union, and are held by them as their joint and common property.

"Resolved, That Congress, as the joint agent and representative of the States of this Union, has no right to make any law or do any act whatever that shall directly, or by its effects, make any discrimination between the States of this Union, by which any of them shall be deprived of its full and equal right in

any territory of the United States, acquired or to be acquired.

"Resolved, That the enactment of any law—and here is the first germ of the present doctrine of the South, and the present agitation of the whole country—"Resolved, That the enactment of any law which should directly, or by its effects, deprive the citizens of any of the States of this Union from emigrating, with their property, into any of the Territories of the United States, will make such discrimination, and would, therefore, be a violation of the Constitution, and the rights of the States from which such citizens emigrated, and in derogation of that perfect equality which belongs to them as members of this Union, and would tend directly to subvert the Union itself."

When these resolutions were read, the Senator from Missouri, "Old Bullion"—a Senator from the slave State—denounced them as a "firebrand." The next day Mr. Calhoun pressed them to a vote. Mr. Benton opposed the proposition. Mr. Calhoun expressed his surprise that Mr. Benton, as the representative from a Southern State, should oppose the resolutions, but added, "I shall know where to find the gentleman." "Yes, sir; yes, sir," said "Old Bullion," "always know where to find me—by the side of my country and the Union—always there." (Loud applause.) Six years later that brave old man writing upon the subject, says:

"Ostensibly the complaint (expressed in these resolutions), was that the emigrant from the slave State was not allowed to carry his slave with him; in reality it was that he was not allowed to carry the State law along with him to protect his slave. Placed in that light, which is the true one, the complaint is absurd; presented as applying to a piece of property, instead of the law of the State, it becomes specious—has deluded whole communities, and has led to rage and resentment, and hatred of the Union."

Mr. Benton looked upon them as a "firebrand" when they were introduced, and writing quietly in his closet, six years thereafter, he expressed himself as I have just read.

Who is the author of the Kansas-Nebraska bill? Stephen A. Douglas—I don't know what "A." stands for. I have heard it is for Arnold, but I don't believe he could have been so fitly named at his christening. Stephen A. Douglas is the author of that Bill, but does Stephen A. Douglas believe, or did he believe, that Congress had no right to legislate on the subject of slavery in the Territories? Were these the doctrines in which he was reared in the bosom of the Democratic party of Illinois and of the Union? No, my friends; he was reared in the sound Constitutional doctrine which I have uttered here to-night, and I will prove it to you.

In 1848 Congress was engaged in establishing a government for the Territory of Oregon. A territorial bill had passed the lower House containing no provision on the subject of slavery. It came up to the Senate, and Mr. Hale at once moved the "Jefferson Proviso;" in

other words, he moved to insert the clause that "involuntary servitude, except as punishment for crime, should be prohibited within the Territory forever." Did Stephen A. Douglas rise in his seat and argue that that was unconstitutional? Did he rise and say that Congress had no power under the Constitution to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories? No, my friends; but he arose and offered an amendment, to wit: the extension of the Missouri Compromise line through the Territories of New Mexico, Utah and California, then recently acquired, to the Pacific ocean. Now, mark you, I am upon the point, has Congress the right and is it its duty to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories? Mr. Douglas moved as an amendment to Mr. Hale's proposition:

"That the line of thirty-six degrees and thirty minutes of north latitude, known as the Missouri Compromise line, as defined by the eighth section of an act entitled, 'An act to authorize the people of the Missouri Territory to form a constitution and State government, and for the admission of such State into the Union, on an equal footing with the original States, and to prohibit slavery in certain Territories,' approved March 6, 1820, be, and the same is hereby declared to extend to the Pacific Ocean; and the said eighth section, together with the compromise therein effected, is hereby revived, and declared to be in full force and binding, for the future organization of the Territories of the United States, in the same sense, and with the same understanding, with which it was originally adopted."

Mr. Douglas, having proposed the amendment, voted for it. Now, is he not a pretty Senator? (Laughter.) Is there another such "artful dodger" in so criminal a matter, in this whole broad country, as this same Stephen A. Douglas, the author of the Kansas-Nebraska bill? (Many voices, "no," "no.") No, there is not. There he was in 1848 ready to legislate upon the subject.

What was done? Now, mark, Mr. Polk was President; James Buchanan was Secretary of State. Mr. Douglas was willing to legislate upon the subject of slavery; there was no denial of the right. It was one year after the introduction of Calhoun's resolutions, but the "Jefferson proviso" was applied to Oregon, and James K. Polk, by and with the advice and consent of his cabinet, signed the bill; and on signing it, he sent in a special message to the Congress of the United States, assigning his reasons for doing so. I will take the liberty of detaining you with a short extract from that message:

"When Texas was admitted into our Union, the same spirit of compromise which guided our predecessors in the admission of Missouri, a quarter of a century before, prevailed without any serious opposition. The joint resolution for annexing Texas to the United States, approved March the first, one thousand eight hundred and forty-five, provides that such States as may be formed out of that portion of said territory lying south of thirty-six de-

grees thirty-minutes north latitude, commonly known as the Missouri Compromise line, shall be admitted into the Union with or without slavery, as the people of each State asking admission may desire. And in such State or States as shall be formed out of said territory north of the Missouri Compromise line, *slavery or involuntary servitude (except for crime) shall be prohibited.* The Territory of Oregon lies far north of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes—the Missouri and Texas Compromise line. Its southern boundary is the parallel of forty-two, leaving the intermediate distance to be three hundred and thirty geographical miles. And it is because the provisions of this bill are not inconsistent with the terms of the Missouri Compromise, if extended from the Rio Grande to the Pacific ocean, that I have not felt at liberty to withhold my sanction."

Now, gentlemen, did Mr. Buchanan believe that it was unconstitutional to legislate upon the subject of slavery in the Territories? If so, pray, why did he not make it known by his resignation from Mr. Polk's cabinet? Why did he let the responsibility rest upon him of sanctioning, as a cabinet minister, an unconstitutional act? He did not doubt either the right or the duty; nor do I believe that in his inmost heart he doubts either now; but ambition has misled him—

"Vaulting ambition, which o'erleaps itself,  
And falls on the other side." (Applause.)

Now let me leave Congress and Senators, and the doings of our legitimate government, and take a peep at the illegitimate government of the country—that organization which establishes platforms of party, by which to override all law and even the Constitution itself. Let me carry you to the Baltimore Convention of 1848, at which Lewis Cass was nominated for the Presidency, and William O. Butler for the Vice-Presidency.

I have shown you that Congress had not abandoned the safe and Constitutional doctrine given us in the example of Washington, Jefferson and Jackson; and I have shown you by Mr. Polk's action, that he and Mr. Buchanan had not yet abandoned it.

The Convention had been at work four days. It had succeeded in making its nominations, and was adopting its platform, when Mr. Yancy, of Alabama, following in the wake of his great master, John C. Calhoun, introduced this resolution:

"Resolved, That the doctrine of non-interference with the rights of property of any portion of this confederation, be it in the States or in the Territories, by any other than the parties interested in them, is the true republican doctrine recognized by this body."

That is, that Congress has no right to interfere; that the slave-owner had a right to take his slaves, and Congress had no right to interfere. Did the Democratic Convention of 1848 accept that doctrine? Were they willing to go before the people upon that issue? No;

they tabled that resolution. They did more, they negatived it by a vote of 246 against it, to 36 for it.

Now we have seen "squatter sovereignty" rejected in the Senate of the United States, when first introduced by Mr. Calhoun, in 1847. In May, 1848, we find it excluded from the doctrines of the Democratic party by the great political Sanhedrim assembled at Baltimore, in a slave State. Now I go on a little farther in that year, and I come to that time, near its close, when James K. Polk, (Mr. Buchanan's great chieftain, as he then was,) presented his last message to the Congress of the United States. Had he yielded to Mr. Calhoun, or to Mr. Yancy, or did he still stand by the experience of the past? The following extract from that message will show what were his sentiments at that time:

"Upon a great emergency, however, and under menacing dangers to the Union, the Missouri Compromise line in respect to slavery was adopted. The same line was extended further West on the acquisition of Texas. After an acquiescence of nearly thirty years in the principle of compromise recognized and established by these acts, and to avoid the danger to the Union which might follow if it were now disregarded. I have heretofore expressed the opinion that that line of compromise should be extended on the parallel of thirty-six degrees thirty minutes from the western boundary of Texas, where it now terminates, to the Pacific Ocean. This is the middle line of compromise, upon which the different sections of the Union may meet, as they have hitherto met."

Here is Mr. Buchanan, as a member of Mr. Polk's Cabinet, presenting Mr. Polk's annual message, with a recommendation to Congress to legislate upon the subject of slavery—to declare that all territory north of 36 degrees 30 minutes shall be forever free, and that all south of it may take its chance, and be slave territory if the people want it, or be free territory if the people want it—not to declare that one-half shall be slave territory and one-half free, but that all north of that line shall be forever free, and the other may take its chance of being made free or slave as may be determined.

No, no, gentlemen; the doctrines of to-day as yet had no existence, save in the plotting brains of three or four southern disunionists; they were yet to be made so-called "national" doctrines.

Let us now go one step further. When I went out of politics I was a partisan Democrat, and I stand to-day, so far as slavery is concerned, upon the doctrines which I then rested upon; and as I have shown you they were the doctrines of the administration of Polk and Dallas—the last administration which I helped to elect. They continued to be the doctrines of the State of Pennsylvania throughout the existence of that great man at whose hands I received my first appointment to the judgeship—Francis R. Shunk. He died just after

his election to a second term. A convention was called, which nominated Morris Longstreth for the gubernatorial chair. At that time nothing was said upon the subject of slavery, for it was not then a subject of agitation. But during that year there was agitation. The doctrines of Calhoun and Yancy were brought before the people; Southern conventions were being held: Calhoun resolutions were being sent from State Legislature to State Legislature in the South; disunion conventions were being held in the Southern States, and it became the duty of the Democrats, as of the other parties of the North, to speak their opinions upon the subject of slavery. And when, on the 4th of July, 1849, the Democratic party assembled in State Convention at Pittsburgh, the question of slavery was agitated. Among the regular set of resolutions submitted to that convention, there was none touching the question of slavery. Gentlemen rose and objected to the resolutions; gentlemen upon the committee insisted that the opinion of the convention should be expressed upon the subject of slavery; and at length Col. Samuel W. Black, a delegate from Alleghany county, proposed the following resolution, which was unanimously adopted as the doctrine of the Democratic party of Pennsylvania, by that State Convention, assembled on the 4th of July, 1849:—

"Resolved, That the Democratic party adheres now, as it ever has done, to the Constitution of the country. Its letter and spirit they will neither weaken nor destroy, and they *re-declare*"—they announce no new doctrine; they do not declare for the first time—"that slavery is a local, domestic institution of the South, subject to State law alone, and with which the General Government has nothing to do. Wherever the State law extends its jurisdiction, the local institution can continue to exist. *Esteeming it a violation of State rights to carry it beyond State limits*, we deny the power of any citizen to extend the area of bondage beyond its present dominion; nor do we consider it a part of the compromise of the Constitution, that slavery should forever travel with the advancing column of our territorial progress."

Gentlemen, do I not stand to-night upon what was the doctrine of the Democratic party on the Fourth of July, 1849? (Applause.) Standing upon that doctrine, I stand upon what has been, from the formation of the government down to the present time, the doctrine of the Whig party, North and South. I stand upon what was the doctrine of the country. It knew no party division upon this subject until Mr. Calhoun hatched the treasonable doctrines. The South—not the Southern people—not even the Southern slave-owners, but the traders in politics at the South—seized upon the doctrine, and made the South a unit upon the question of slavery extension. Then came bidding for Presidential nominations; then came the Kansas-Nebraska act, by which that great compromise line was repealed, and

by which it is asserted that slavery may walk all over the territories of the Union.

Were you Whigs or were you Democrats—for, at the time of which I have been speaking, you were all one or the other—your sympathies lay with one or the other of those great parties. I care not which you were, I have enunciated your doctrines. And will you now abandon them? Why will you now fail to sustain them? Why will you not now stand up for what was your doctrine, as it had been the doctrine of the Adamses, of Harrison, and of Taylor, on the one hand, and of Jefferson, of Jackson, of Madison, of Van Buren, and of Polk, on the other—as it had been the doctrine of the great Washington—too great to belong to either, but belonging to all parties and to all countries? (Unbounded applause.) Why, I say, will you abandon the doctrine in which you were reared, and which has the sanction of all the great patriots and statesmen, whose names you revere, whose memories you love? I ask it, whether you be Buchanan men or Fillmore men, for in the one case you are asked to oppose the doctrine, and in the other you are asked to vote for a man who *does not tell you on which side of the great issue he stands.* (Applause.)

Now, my friends, shall slavery be permitted to go beyond that line? (A general response from the audience of “no, no.”) No. Let Pennsylvania answer, as with one voice, “No.” (Deafening applause for several minutes.) The power is in our hands. Maine and Vermont give us the voice of New England; Iowa gives us the voice of the West; and let the great old “Wheel-horse of the Union,” Pennsylvania, stand firm, and freedom will be established forever in those territories, large enough to make more than thirty-one Pennsylvanias. (Long-continued cheering.) We are to settle the question. It is *framed* by the friends of freedom that we will settle it upon a side-issue; it is *hoped* by the friends of slavery that we will settle it upon a side issue.

I have had handed to me, since I came upon the stand, by a gentleman who sits beside me, a copy of the *Madison Journal*, published in Richmond, Louisiana, which has at its head the names of James Buchanan, of Pennsylvania, for President, and John C. Breckenridge, of Kentucky, for Vice-President. He has called my attention to a paragraph, which I will read:

“MR. FILLMORE NOT TO BE WITHDRAWN.—The New Orleans *Picayune* has a dispatch from Washington, dated the 18th, to the effect that Mr. Fillmore is not to be withdrawn. We are glad to hear it. Mr. Fillmore may, by continuing a candidate, yet serve the cause of conservatism, *by preventing the concentration of the entire opposition in the North upon Fremont.* No one has the least idea that he can carry a single State, but he may, possibly, prevent the success of Fremont in a single one, and thus give a wider margin to the nationality of Mr. Buchanan's election.”

Men of Pennsylvania, are you willing to be the cat in the hands of the monkey to pull so great a chestnut as that out of the fire?

(Laughter, and cries of “no, no”) Workingmen of Pennsylvania, merchants of Pennsylvania, farmers of Pennsylvania, are you willing to be used by the trading politicians of the South, and induced to vote for a man who they say has not a chance to carry a single State, in order that Kansas first, and then all the territory through to the Pacific, may be shut against the free white laborer—against wages—against the hopes, the enterprise, the prospects of the poor man of the world? (Many voices, “no,” “never.”) Stand upon the Constitution; stand firm for freedom; plant your feet where Washington and Jefferson stood; plant your feet where Polk stood, with Buchanan beside him, in 1848, and say, “Thus far, accursed institution, thou shalt come; thus far thou art protected by State institutions, and as we are loyal to the Constitution, we will defend you there ourselves; but beyond that, by the grace of God, and by the power of a freeman's vote, you never shall go.” (Great applause.)

What is it, my fellow-citizens, that they ask of us? What have we not done for that fretful, peevish, boastful, lazy South? Why, we have bought them Florida; we have bought them the Louisiana territory; we have bought them the Missouri territory. We have bought them, not by our money and our labor alone, but by the best blood of our sons and brothers, the territory (capable of making four large States,) known as Texas. We have expended between eight and nine hundred millions of dollars—in interest and all, very nearly a thousand millions of dollars—in acquiring territory which has all been made into slave States; freedom has obtained no foot of it. The States thus acquired are Florida, Louisiana, Arkansas, Missouri and Texas. They send to the House of Representatives sixteen members, while they send to the Senate ten! Think of it, my fellow-citizens; it takes over ninety thousand of you to get a representative in Congress, while twenty-seven thousand white people in Florida get one Representative and two members of the United States Senate. Those five States, with people enough to give them sixteen Representatives, have ten members of the Senate, while New York, which has thirty-three members of the lower house, and more than twice the number of people that all those States contain, black and white, has but two Senators. Pennsylvania, with her large population, almost doubling that of those States, has but two Senators.

Now, my friends, shall Kansas be made a slave State, in order that with a few thousand people there and their slaves, she shall have as many votes in the Senate, as New York or Pennsylvania. I say “with but a few thousand people and their slaves,” because, let slavery get a footing there and Kansas will be no more largely peopled, in proportion to the square mile, than Texas, or Louisiana, or Florida is now. Why? The reason is a very simple one. There is no law on the statute book to prevent you, my overworked working man, from emigrating to the South. There is

no law of that country which forbids you, poor man, who feel that you are working for inadequate wages, from making your home in the South, where the climate is genial, the soil better, the season for fuel shorter, and where there are a thousand advantages which we do not possess here in the cold North. Why do you not go? You cannot, although there is no law to prevent you. I am mistaken; I should have said, there is no law upon the statute book; but when the Great Creator gave law to this universe, he provided that injustice and wrong should not be inflicted without a penalty. He provided that those who do wrong shall suffer misery; that those who "grind the faces of the poor," and deprive the laborer of his wages, shall have a curse in some form entailed upon them; and we find it there. It is the existence of slavery in the Southern States that excludes the white laboring man.

Compare the statistics of a free State with those of a slave State. Take the census of 1850, (Table I.) and compare New York with Virginia—cold New York with her upper boundary at 45—sunny Virginia with her lower boundary at 36—winter "lingering" long "in the lap of spring," at the northern line of New York; winter scarcely existing at the southern line of Virginia. I find that they were admitted into the Union together in 1789. They are of the old States. New York has 47,000 square miles of territory, and Virginia 61,352. Mark the difference in size. The population of Virginia is as 23 to a square mile, while that of New York is as 66 to a square mile. In 1790 the population of New York was 340,120; that of Virginia was 748,308—more than twice, largely more than twice that of New York. How do they stand now? The free white population of Virginia is now 894,800; the free white population of New York is, 3,048,325. Just think of it. Little New York—for little she is, in comparison with Virginia, has 3,048,325 white inhabitants, while the old mother of commonwealths and statesmen has but 894,800.

But, workingmen, do you value the privileges of free schools, and institutions of learning? While you are at labor in the workshop, do you not feel that, though you have to toil hard for a beggarly subsistence, your children, by the aid of our public schools and public libraries, shall stand the peers of the proudest in the land, and may rise, like "the Natick cobbler," to be the great man of the United States Senate? (Enthusiastic applause.) Yes, such feelings are in all your hearts. Let us take a glimpse at Virginia and New York, as compared in that respect. In New York, the native free population, over twenty years of age, that, in 1850, could not read or write, was as one in every 79; while in Virginia it was as one in every 17. Why should they teach "the poor white trash" to read? they do not want to use them. The slaves do the work, and rich men only are worthy of consideration. Why should they keep public schools, to put fanciful notions into the heads

of people that do not own property in slaves and are of no use in the community, but only an incumbrance?

Now, let me compare briefly Kentucky and Ohio. [See table II., appended.] Kentucky was admitted into the Union in 1792; Ohio was admitted ten years thereafter, in 1802; she is the younger sister of Kentucky. Ten years difference in the age of such young States is really a difference worthy of consideration. Ohio contains about twenty-five millions of acres and Kentucky twenty-four millions. The difference between them is about a million of acres, or about two thousand square miles. Ohio is rather the largest. At this time the population to the square mile is twenty-six in Kentucky, and forty-nine and a-half in her younger sister, Ohio. In 1800, Ohio had forty-five thousand inhabitants, and Kentucky two hundred and twenty thousand. In 1850, the free white population of Kentucky was 761,413, while her sister, Ohio, had 1,955,050, exceeding that of Kentucky by about 1,200,000. Let us again examine the question as to who could read and write. In 1850, the native free population over twenty years of age unable to read or write, was in Ohio, 1 in 31, in Kentucky 1 in 11, nearly as bad as in Virginia.

Between Michigan and Arkansas the same relations prevail. [See table III., appended.] Michigan was admitted into the Union in 1837, Arkansas in 1836. Michigan has about 56,343 square miles of territory, Arkansas 52,198. In 1820 Arkansas had 14,273 inhabitants, Michigan 8,596. In 1850 the free population of Michigan was 395,071; that of Arkansas, her elder sister, was 162,189. In Michigan of those over twenty years of age, 1 in 65 cannot read or write; in Arkansas 1 in 9—worse than Virginia; "poor white trash," again. (Laughter.)

Now let us come to the States of Brooks and Sumner—South Carolina and Massachusetts. [See Table IV.] They came into the Union at the same time. We see Massachusetts a mere speck on the map, lying between New Hampshire and Vermont on the north and Connecticut on the south; we see South Carolina a large body of land, nearly four times as large as Massachusetts. Massachusetts has 7,250 square miles; South Carolina has 28,000 square miles. They came into the Union together. Their population in 1790 was 378,717 in Massachusetts and 249,073 in South Carolina.—Of free white population Massachusetts has now 985,450—a hundred thousand more than Virginia. While Massachusetts has 985,450, South Carolina has 274,562—about one quarter as many. And that is the State that is going to thrash the Union, (laughter); and on the 4th of March, at a quarter to 12, or a quarter after, (I forget which; I hope I may get right in regard to it before the time comes,) they are to "take possession of the archives and Treasury of the Union," and the North is to be nowhere—that's the programme. (Great laughter.) There are 274,000 white inhabitants to take

care of 384,000 "niggers" as she calls them ; and I think that while they are away taking care of the Treasury and the archives, the "niggers," upon the principle "when the cat's away the mice will play," will have some fun. (Shouts of laughter.)

Now, look at these two States as to reading and writing. In Massachusetts, of those over 20 years of age there are but 1,861 who cannot read and write, or one in every 446, (great applause,) while in South Carolina there is one in every seventeen ! And do you wonder that in a State where one in every seventeen cannot read or write, they lavish silver pitchers and gold-headed canes upon a man who tells them himself what he has been doing ; they don't hear of it in any other way than by what he chooses to let them know. And Arkansas—what an idea, to indict a man for sending "incendiary documents" into that State, when one in every nine is not able to read !—And I suppose those who can read, do it very much after the fashion of the boys that we have here in the House of Refuge. You say to one of them, "Can you read and write ?" "Yes sir, I can read," is the reply. You give the fellow some simple book and he begins, "A c-a-t 'cat,' saw—no, w-a-s, 'was ;'" (loud laughter) and so he gets along with words of one syllable by spelling the longer ones. Where one in every nine cannot read at all, we may take it for granted that the majority read after the fashion of our newly admitted House of Refuge boys, and not much better. (Laughter.)

I do not mean to say that that is true as to all, for the Southern slaveholder and planter leads a lordly life ; absorbing to himself the labor of 50, 100, 500 or 1000 men and women, he can afford to educate his children and to lead a life of lavish expenditure. But I do mean to say that a man in a slave State, who hopes by his own labor to support himself and raise his family, has no chance of seeing any of them taught to read and write, in any just sense of the expression. I do mean to say that there are no public schools for such ; I do mean to say that there are no public libraries for such ; and I do mean to say that the life of a laboring man—a purely laboring man—in the slave States, is a life of degradation, shutting out every hope of advancement to himself and to his children ; (applause) and I mean to say, my fellow citizens, that because the free laborers understand this, that beautiful region of country constituting the Southern States is so sparsely populated, while here at the North, population is already becoming too dense. You know the efforts that are required to be made during the winter in New York and Boston, and Philadelphia, to ferret out the laboring poor who may chance to be unemployed and are suffering.

You know that when there is any derangement in the financial affairs of our country, or in the commercial affairs of the world, there comes a glut in the labor market—our laborers are unemployed, our poor laboring men and our poor laboring women are without

work, and then the "times are hard." As I said before, why do they not emigrate to the "sunny South ?" It is because times are still harder there. What does the laboring man or the laboring woman get for wages in slave States ? When I asked the question at a meeting the other night, the response from one of my hearers was "nix," and it was right. I answered that it was "*nichts kom raus*," and worse than that, because, not only does the slave give his labor, but he gives his children as pay for his food and clothing. Do you know that the time was when a slave babe was worth but twenty dollars in this country. When I stated the other night, at a meeting, that a slave babe was now worth fifty dollars, a gentleman from Missouri, who was present—a *Fremont man*, (loud applause)—told me that I was mistaken, that the average value of a healthy slave babe, at the hour of its birth, is now one hundred dollars.

The poor slave mother is toiling in the cotton field, toiling in the kitchen, toiling as the dressing-maid to her mistress ; and the poor slave-father is laboring in the field, or in the blacksmith shop, or in the iron works, or in the tobacco factory, or in the cotton factories of Savannah—for slaves work in them all. When a child is to be born to the woman it inspires no hope in her heart, and no aspiration in that of the father. There are no cheering preparations made to welcome the "little stranger" who generally, though coming as a burden and a tax on its parents is still received as a joy to their hearts. The babe comes and brings them no expense ; they make no preparation ; they have no "doctor's bill" to pay. They have no hope that they shall see the little thing play in childish sports about their knee, and, as he advances to boyhood, grow in intelligence and vigor and enter the field for boyish sports with his companions. They have no hope that they shall see him acquiring skill in any trade, profession, or handicraft in his riper years—no dream that they shall see him in manhood, a man among men, casting a lustre over their age, and becoming a prop to them in their declining years. Or if the child be a daughter, they have no hope that she shall be the companion of the mother in her otherwise solitary hours, and the one who in old age shall smooth the dying pillow of her parents. No : the child comes, and they are conscious that it is so much more money added to their labor to pay for their poor food and clothing. The child may be torn from the mother's bosom as a blind pup is torn from its mother, and she never hear of it again. It is counted as gain, as the calf, or the colt, or the young lamb, found in the morning by the side of the cow, or the dam, or the old ewe. Does the child bring hope to the heart of its parents ? Why did that slave-woman kill her children, rather than let them go to the South side of the Ohio river ? It was because the girls would go there for degradation, and the boys for slavery, or labor without wages, and without the right to own their own limbs or their own bodies.

Can the free laborer work in the midst of a system of that kind? You *do* expect to rear your children; you welcome the "doctor's bill," the first tax which they bring you. You clothe them; you provide for them in advance, and when you labor hard to provide them sustenance, you do it cheerfully, because in them your hope lives, and their future gilds your downward path in life.

And, again, I ask you, laborer, can you say that others shall be doomed to labor in all the twelve Pennsylvanias embraced in Kansas Territory, beside that system of servile labor? Will you, workmen of Pennsylvania, forever exclude your posterity from all that territory acquired by the common country of which you are citizens? I do not believe you will. Let us trust fellow citizens that it may not be done.

Test the proposition by the democratic rule, "the greatest good of the greatest number." It is said that the South will be injured if she cannot take her slaves into all our vast territory. Who and what is the South? The South is six millions of free people, living in States which embrace over nine hundred thousand square miles of territory, and they have with them over three millions of slaves. What is the North? They have not nine hundred thousand miles of territory; they have but four hundred and fifty thousand miles, on which there are dwelling this day *thirteen* millions of free people. Now, I say the South has forced this issue upon us, and suppose we accept it as an issue in which one or the other must be injured, shall the injured party be the *six* millions who have nine hundred thousand square miles of territory to dwell in, or the *thirteen* millions who have but four hundred and fifty thousand miles. Shall slavery be hemmed in, or shall the freemen of the North be crushed into that little space? That is the question, my fellow citizens, for you to decide, and as you vote at the coming Presidential election, so, perhaps will you in Philadelphia decide it.

But, say you, slavery is in the States, and we have nothing to do with it there. So say I. The Constitution, you say, protects it in the States. So says every Republican; and we agree that it is our duty, as citizens loyal to the Constitution, to protect slavery in the States; but the question for us to decide is, shall it go in the Territories? Shall the white laboring man be "crushed out?" Shall we be pent up in these fifteen States, so that the population shall become so abundant, and land so high, that wages will fall and the white man be little better than a slave? Where, my friends, will the European emigrant find a footing, when New York, and Philadelphia, and Boston, and Baltimore, and Cincinnati have their over-crowded streets, and lanes, and alleys, and when there shall be no cheap land in the far West to emigrate to? What will be the condition of the American laborer? Will not twenty or thirty years serve to bring us to Mr. Buchanan's standard of wages—the European standard—that which drives the Irishman, and the German, and every other

European from his land? Is there not every day a tide of emigration flowing from the cities, westward—flowing from all the old States, westward—taking up new land and settling there, opening up a field of labor and thus keeping up wages? Now, let slavery, which now shuts us out from the South, shut us out from the North, and we are pent in, and in a little while our condition will be like that of Europe. Oh! my fellow-citizens, what would be the condition of the South then! There is there a servile race, tyrannized over by their masters, but held in bondage by the great free North. We catch them when they attempt to run away and send them back; it is known to them that we have power to crush them if they attempt to escape. But reduce the laboring masses of the North to "ten cents a day," or to twenty-five cents a day, or to "the European standard of wages" (to quote Mr. Buchanan's precise language,) and there comes an affinity between the oppressed of the North and the oppressed of the South, which would make a fearful day of reckoning to those who had done the wrong.

"But," say some, "it is only a wrong to the negro—it does not touch the white man: it is only a wrong to the farm-laborer—it does not touch the man of the work-shop, and the mechanic." Let me tell you that you make a mistake there. Let me read to you an advertisement from the Richmond (Va.) *Dispatch*, of January, 1856:

"SERVANT HIRING.—In Richmond, Va., servants, both male and female, are commanding higher prices this year than the past. Farm hands bring from \$180 to \$163, and women from \$40 to \$75 per year. *Factory hands have advanced about 15 per cent.* on last year, and first-rate female cooks, of good character, and without encumbrance, have advanced even above that ratio."

"Factory hands." What sort of factories? Why, my friends, all the tobacco of Richmond, the great tobacco city of this country, is made by slaves. If you go into their tobacco factories, you find no white working men, or working women there. You find them all slaves. I said you find no white working men, or working women there—I made a mistake: I mean you find no free ones; they are all slaves, though some are as white as any of you. Go into Tennessee, at the iron works there, and you shall find none but slaves laboring there: in the ore banks or the coaling operations, or in the manufacture and working of iron. I appeal to any colonizationist that is here to say whether during the last three years a prominent gentleman of Tennessee—I believe it is Hon. Mr. Fell—has not sent to Liberia 120 excellent iron workers, men and women, from his iron works to develop the iron resources of Africa? We have the slave labor of Virginia competing with free labor in the manufacture of tobacco. In Tennessee slave labor is competing with the free labor of Pennsylvania in the manufacture of iron. Go to Georgia and you find them boasting that Georgia is "the Massachusetts of the South." They

take you to their cotton factories and through their various workshops, and you find slaves performing all the labor in every establishment; and I challenge you to study the freight-lists of the line of steamers, plying between this city and Savannah, Georgia, and you will find that they carry steadily to Philadelphia coarse cotton-fabrics, manufactured by slaves near the cotton-fields in the neighborhood of Savannah; and they undersell the Philadelphia mechanic in his own city, because their labor is labor without wages—labor at the hands of people who beget children, and whose children are counted as cattle by their owners.

Not only do they interfere with labor of this kind; but I tell you, my friends, the question is pressed upon us by the South for the *establishment of white slavery*. This is no idle talk. They say their institution is no longer safe if it depends upon the doctrine of *African slavery*. This is a necessity of the South. Let me read to you an advertisement taken from the *Richmond Enquirer* of Feb. 27th, 1856. A runaway, "*Phil.*" is advertised as belonging to the estate of Wm. Gooch, and is spoken of as follows:

"*The said slave is nearly white, with eyes blue, hair a little curly, is almost 5 feet 10 inches high, not more than 20 years old. It is believed he will endeavor to make his way to a free State as he can anywhere pass for a white man.*"

What is the law of the South upon this question? I quote it as given by the same paper, the *Richmond Enquirer*:

"The laws of all the Southern States, justify the holding of white men in slavery, provided, through the mother, they are descended, *however remotely* from a negro slave."

The first cross is a "half breed;" the second cross is a quadroon. Trace it in geometrical progression. In the next there is but one-eighth of negro blood, in the next (only the fourth cross) there is but one-sixteenth of negro blood; and where the taint is so slight as that, who shall trace it? Who shall discover it? It has reached that point, for many of their slaves have less than one-sixteenth—have but one thirty-second part of African blood in their veins; but so long as the mother is a slave (though she have but one thirty-second part of African blood and the father have none,) the child is still a slave, his condition following that of his mother, on the principle "*partus sequitur ventrem*." The doctrine of white slavery is no mere abstract theory of the South; it is becoming a necessity. They must either emancipate their most valuable slaves, because they are white, or they must insist upon the North surrendering all our extensive territory to their "peculiar institution."

Look at it, my fellow-citizens, am I exaggerating. ("No.") Am I wandering one hair's breadth from the real state of the case? I ask you, Oh! workingmen of Pennsylvania to go to your pillows to-night and ponder, as you have never pondered before, upon the issue that is before you in this election. If you are the friends of freedom—if you love the

Constitution of your country—if you revere the names of its great patriots—if you believe in a superintending and avenging Providence—if you believe in Christianity which teaches you that "in as much as ye have done it unto the least of these," (the suffering ones of earth,) "ye have done it unto your Great Master"—Oh! think, and think that all these matters are connected with your vote in the coming Presidential election—that by your vote you may either say that this institution, which thus degrades humanity, shall be hemmed in to the South of that line of 36 degrees, 30 minutes, or that it shall stalk with unabashed front all over the great territories of the West. You shall say whether the laborer shall walk erect, a freeman, putting his wages in his pocket and spending them at his will, or whether, in the South, white or black, he shall be the mere creature of his owner, and in the North be reduced by the competition of unpaid labor to a condition scarcely more happy than that of the slave.

Is not the issue a portentous one? Is it not one demanding reflection? Is it not one demanding vigorous action? Oh! my fellow countrymen, let not party names mislead you. Be not deluded by the cry of "Americanism," if it would lead you from the free side of this issue. Americanism is to stand up for the freedom and equality of man. (Immense applause.) Americanism is to govern America by a sound American spirit, which will maintain the equality of man and the freedom of man. (Loud cheers.) Be not humbugged, either, by the cry of "Democracy." There was a time when the Democracy of our country claimed to be, and I, at least, believed them to be, "eyes to the blind and feet to the lame"—when I believed they were the friends of freedom, equality and education—when I believed that they strove to give to man the freest and fullest chance to develop himself, and provide for the prosperity of his posterity.

But what is the so-called "Democracy" of to-day? I spurn the Democratic party of to-day. (A perfect storm of applause, which did not subside for several minutes.) I spurn it, because it tramples and spits upon the graves of the great men who organized it, and libels their great names. (Cheering.) I spurn it, because, as I have shown you from these volumes, it has proved recreant to all the great principles that led it on to victory. (Applause.) I spurn it, because, instead of being the friend of labor and the laboring man, it is attempting to degrade the freemen of the north to a level with the slave of the south. (Cheers.) I spurn and I scorn the sham Democracy of to-day, because it is attempting to extend all over our country a system which makes the child of a woman, descended from a slave, a slave, be he as white as white can be—though his blood be Caucasian and his spirit as free as that of Jefferson or of Washington. (Loud applause.) I scorn the Democratic party, because it has silenced its own leaders, or expelled them from its ranks, and placed itself in charge of

the disunion orators of the South. I scorn it because it has in the Cabinet of its President, Jefferson Davis, a disunionist, from Mississippi, and it has sent through the whole North, stumping in its cause, Senator Benjamin, of Louisiana, a disunionist, Senator Toombs, of Georgia, a disunionist, Mr. Alexander H. Stephens, of Georgia, a disunionist—because its columns are led on by men who are pledged to dissolve the Union, and sacrifice the Constitution of my country. (Applause.) I scorn the so-called Democratic party of Pennsylvania especially, because, having silenced its former leaders, or expelled them from its bosom, it has taken those as its champions and its leaders with whom I have had a lifelong political battle.

Why, what is this Democracy? It puts me in mind of a knife which a French gentleman of my acquaintance had, of which he used to boast a great deal. He was a good fellow—a little thick-headed at times, but very kind-hearted. "There," said he, "Mr. K. is one very good knife which I brought from France with me. I value him very much, both because I brought him from France with me, and because he met with some accidents and I got him repaired, and he just as good as ever. First, soon after I came to this country I broke the blade, and I take him to Mr. Shively, in Chestnut street, and he put in a new blade, just so good as the old one; then, a good while after that, I broke the handle, accidentally, and I go to Mr. Shively again, but Mr. Shively move away, and I go around in Second street, to Mr. Richardson, and I get a new handle on—so I have my same old knife just as good as new." (Laughter.) The Democratic party have got a new blade and a new handle, new principles and new leaders, (great laughter,) but it is, they say, the same old party, just as good as new.

My friends, don't believe them—don't believe them. Look for yourselves, think for yourselves, inquire for yourselves. If you have thought of voting either for Mr. Buchanan or Mr. Fillmore, pause, ponder and study. Do not take my assertion. Do not take the assertion of any partisan leader. God knows I do not propose voluntarily to become your leader. I did not seek the position in which I stand. I was absent from my home, and far distant when I first heard that I had been nominated. My ready answer was, I cannot accept—I cannot serve; and nothing but a sense of duty has brought me to the mind to serve. But I ask you, while you listen to me, to think—when you leave me to examine the question which I have put before you, and to look to the authorities. If I have made a misstatement, I have made it unconsciously. If I have made a misstatement, I have been misled by the law books that I have studied—by the authority which I bring here, [Benton's Thirty Years' View,] by the various ones which my library furnishes, by which I test it. I have presented to you the doctrines of the great fathers of the country, without di-

vision of party, without division of section, and I ask you to stand by them.

"Well," say some, "you are right in theory, you are right in doctrine; but the Union! the Union! save the Union!" Why the Union is in just about as much danger as the Rocky Mountains. (Laughter.) It would be quite as easy at this moment to dissolve the Rocky Mountains, as it would be to dissolve this Union. Our party is the Constitutional party. (Loud cheering.) We stand where the fathers of our country stood—we stand where the Whig party and the Democratic party agreed in standing, down till the present administration. (Applause.) And there can be no dissolution of the Union for adhering to this doctrine.

"But," say some, "you have taken up two candidates from the North, two from one section, and Mr. Fillmore says that the South ought not to stand that. They stood it when our distinguished townsman, Richard Rush, ran as a candidate for the Vice Presidency, with John Adams, of Massachusetts, for President. They stood it when General William Henry Harrison, of Ohio, ran with Granger of New York. We stood it when Andrew Jackson of Tennessee, ran with John C. Calhoun, of South Carolina. It has been stood so often that there is no danger of dissolution on that score.

But our position is this: if we are beaten, we acquiesce, pick our flint, and fire again (applause); and if we are victorious, *we will see who will dissolve the Union.* (Vociferous cheers. A voice—"That's it!") Why, there is as much of Andrew Jackson in John C. Fremont as there could be if he were "a chip of the old block," or as there is in any other human being that lives. (Great applause.) "Old Hickory" himself lived upon acorns, and Fremont has tasted a little dog's meat—just as Caleb Cushing has, though Cushing did it by mistake. When on his Chinese mission, he was dining with a Chinaman of rank, and, according to the rules of Chinese etiquette, had to taste of every dish. One he tasted which pleased his palate exceedingly. Wishing to inquire what it was, and being unable to speak the language, said he, supposing it to be duck, "Quack, quack?" "No, no," replied the Chinaman, very promptly; "bow, wow, wow!" (Shouts of laughter.) But when Col. Fremont went to the Indian council, and they set before him roast dog meat, he knew he had to show himself able to do anything and everything; so he went at it with as much alacrity as the hungriest Indian present. He says he did not like it much, but he was in the service of his country, and must not shrink; so he ate it.

Again, see the bearing of Colonel Fremont in that terrible expedition, which he undertook at his own expense, to explore the Rocky Mountains. His guide had misled him, and on one of the highest peaks, thirteen thousand feet above our level, they were almost blinded by a drift of hard frozen snow, through which

they had to walk waist deep. They gathered their little forces together—he and his thirty-three men, and sheltered themselves for the night. It was the 24th of December. In the morning they made their way back over the peak to get its shelter against the wind. Their mules huddled together as by instinct to keep themselves warm, and fell one after another, making the *nucleus* of a snow-bank. Their implements were lost, and such unexpected dangers and difficulties had encompassed them, that despair seemed to be overtaking the men. He rallied their spirits, and he spent that Christmas *reading Blackstone*, to show them that he was not disconcerted, and that he did not feel disheartened by danger. When cut off from all resources, misled by his guide, deceived by one in whom he trusted, with the hearts of his men curdling in their bosoms, and the dumb brutes, who could not be inspired by his bravery, sinking around him, he calmly took up a volume of *Blackstone*; and by that decision of character, that apparent indifference to the circumstances that surrounded him, he assured his men that their detention was, after all, but a mere Christmas halt. When they had sufficiently rested, he dispatched a detachment on the backward track for assistance, and when they did not return in time, he himself, with knapsack on his back, sought relief, and found his poor men maddened with hunger and the effects of the cold. He hurried on, and on, and on, until he found relief, and saved the great body of that company of men. We have in him a man who has exhibited the character of Napoleon for energy—the character of Jackson for firmness, for decision, for coolness—a man who has never been President, it is true, but who has never been called to perform any duty, civil or military, in which he has not shown himself “up to the mark”—(long continued, enthusiastic applause)—a man born in the South, reared in the South, but who has served his whole country—a man familiar with all history, and especially familiar with all American history—the first enlightened man that traversed this region of Kansas—the man who gave, not only to America, but to the world; the knowledge—the complete knowledge, I

might say—of the Rocky Mountains, their passes, their various scientific disclosures; he revealed them all, and with wonderful rapidity. The man who gave freedom to California, and who represented that State with marked ability for a short time in the councils of the nation—the man (and mark it) whom the leaders of the Democratic party, one year ago, sought to make the candidate of that party for the Presidency. The proof is clear and undoubted, that rather more than a year ago, Governor Floyd, of Virginia, and other distinguished Democrats, sought to make Mr. Fremont the candidate of the Democratic party. He listened to them, and when he found that they would ask him to approve of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise line, he said to them, “Never;” that he had been a Democrat; that he owed to the Democratic party all the political preferment he had ever had; that he had no political aspirations; but were the Presidency of the United States twenty times that Presidency, he never would consent to see slavery extended by the abolition or abrogation of the Missouri Compromise line. (Great applause.) He is a man fit for any and for every emergency; and a man behind whom, in the Vice-Presidential chair, will stand one of the youngest and ablest jurists of New Jersey—a man who has distinguished himself upon the bench as a lawyer and a chancellor, and who has rendered himself eminent in the councils of the nation—a safe man—a cautious man—a firm man. They are both the friends of freedom; and I ask you, let your party predilections hitherto have been what they may, to unite with one common consent, and vote for your own old doctrines—vote for the doctrines of Washington and Jefferson, and Polk, and Harrison, and Taylor—vote for the freedom of the North—for the enfranchisement of labor and the preservation of its freedom—vote for man, as man—vote for Fremont and Dayton, and leave other issues to take care of themselves hereafter. Americans cannot “govern America” until we have a free America to be governed. (Rapturous applause, which continued for sometime.)

Table I.—Comparison between the States of New York and Virginia.

	New York.	Virginia.
Incorporated into Union.....	1789	1789
Area of territory, sq. ms.....	47,000	61,352
Population to sq. m. 1850....	66	23
Population in 1790.....	340,120	748,308
Population in 1800.....	586,756	880,200
Population in 1810.....	959,049	974,622
Population in 1820.....	1,373,812	1,066,379
Population in 1830.....	1,918,608	1,211,405
Population in 1840.....	2,428,921	1,239,797
Population in 1850.....	5,097,394	1,421,661
Free White Pop. in 1790.....	314,142	442,115
Free White Pop. in 1800.....	556,039	514,280
Free White Pop. in 1810.....	918,099	551,534
Free White Pop. in 1820.....	1,332,744	603,087
Free White Pop. in 1830.....	1,873,633	694,300
Free White Pop. in 1840.....	2,378,890	740,858
Free White Pop. in 1850.....	3,048,325	894,800
Slaves in 1790.....	21,324	293,427
Slaves in 1800.....	20,343	315,796
Slaves in 1810.....	15,017	392,518
Slaves in 1820.....	10,083	425,152
Slaves in 1830.....	7	469,757
Slaves in 1840.....	4	449,087
Slaves in 1850.....	None.	472,523
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1800	77.0	16.32
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1810	65.22	7.24
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1820	45.06	9.34
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1830	40.54	15.12
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1840	26.96	6.70
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1850	23.14	20.77
No. of Church Sittings, 1850	1,915,179	858,086
Pupils in Pub. Schools, 1850	675,221	67,353
Native free population over 20 years of age, that in 1850 could not read or write.....	80,670	87,383
That is.....	1 in 79	1 in 17
No. of newspapers, 1850.....	423	80
Volumes in public libraries, 1850.....	1,760,820	88,462
Presidential vote in 1852.....	522,244	129,545
Electors of President in 1856	35	15
Representatives in Congress	33	13
Voters, entitled to choose one Representative to Congress	15,827	9,965
Value of real estate and personal estate.....	\$1,080,309,216	\$389,731,488
Do. to each free person.....	\$316	\$411
Product of Manufactures, Mining and Mechanic arts, 1850.....	\$237,597,249	\$28,705,387
Cash Value of Farms, 1850....	\$554,246,642	\$28,028,563
Value of Land per acre.....	\$75	\$15
Value of Live Stock, 1850.....	\$73,570,492	\$23,656,659
Value of Animals slaughtered, 1850.....	\$13,573,883	\$7,502,986
Population employed in Agriculture.....	445,954	318,771
Tonnage employed in Foreign Commerce, 1851.....	141,546,533	552,933
Miles of Railroad.....	3,600	1,295
Miles of Canal.....	939	189

Table II.—Comparison between Ohio and Kentucky.

	Ohio.	Kentucky.
Incorporated into Union.....	1802	1792
Territory, square miles.....	39,964	37,680
Territory, acres.....	25,576,960	24,115,200
Population to square miles....	49½	25
Population in 1800.....	45,365	220,955
Population in 1810.....	230,760	406,511
Population in 1820.....	581,434	564,317
Population in 1830.....	937,993	687,917
Population in 1840.....	1,519,467	779,328
Population in 1850.....	1,980,329	982,405
Free White Pop., 1800.....	45,028	179,871
Free White Pop., 1810.....	228,661	324,237
Free White Pop., 1820.....	576,572	434,644
Free White Pop., 1830.....	923,329	517,787
Free White Pop., 1840.....	1,502,122	590,253
Free White Pop., 1850.....	1,955,050	761,413
Slave Pop., 1800.....	None	40,348
Slave Pop., 1810.....	None	80,561
Slave Pop., 1820.....	None	126,732
Slave Pop., 1830.....	6	165,218
Slave Pop., 1840.....	3	182,258
Slave Pop., 1850.....	None	210,981
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1810	408.26	80.26
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1820	151.93	34.06
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1830	61.0	19.32
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1840	61.8	13.99
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1850	30.15	28.99
No. of Church Sittings, 1850.	1,457,769	673,528
Pupils in Pub. Schools, 1850.	484,153	71,429
Native Free Pop. over 20 yr's. of age unable to read or write, 1850.....	56,958	67,359
That is.....	1 in 31	1 in 11
No. of Newspapers, 1850.....	261	62
Vols. in Public Libraries.....	186,823	75,466
Presidential vote in 1852.....	853,428	111,079
Electors of President, 1856....	23	12
Represent in Congress.....	21	10
Voters entitled to choose one Representative to Congress	16,830	11,307
Value of Real and Personal Estate.....	\$504,727,126	\$301,628,456
Value to each Free Person....	\$255	\$291
Annual Product of Mechanical Industry.....	\$62,647,259	\$24,588,488
Cash Value of Farms.....	\$558,758,603	\$155,021,282
Value of Land, per acre.....	\$65	\$25
Value of Live Stock, 1850.....	\$44,121,741	\$29,661,335
Value of Slaughtered Animals, 1850.....	\$7,439,243	\$6,462,598
Pop. employed in Agricul.....	272,579	197,738
Miles of Railroad.....	2,725	284
Miles of Canal.....	921	486

Table III.—Michigan and Arkansas.

	Michigan. Jan. 26, 1837	Arkansas. Ju. 15, 1836
Incorporated into Union.....	56,343	52,198
Territory in square miles.....		
Population to the square mile, 1850.....	7.07	4.02
Population in 1820.....	8,896	14,273
Population in 1830.....	31,639	30,383
Population in 1840.....	212,267	97,574
Population in 1850.....	397,654	209,897
Free White Pop. in 1820.....	8,591	12,570
Free White Pop. in 1830.....	31,346	25,671
Free White Pop. in 1840.....	211,960	77,174
Free White Pop. in 1850.....	395,071	162,189
Slave Population in 1820.....	None	1,617
Slave Population in 1830.....	None	4,576
Slave Population in 1840.....	None	19,935
Slave Population in 1850.....	None	47,100
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1830	264.87	104.07
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1840	574.91	200.62
In. of White Pop. pr. ct., 1850	86.74	110.16
No. of Church Sittings, 1850.	120,117	60,226
Pupils in Pub. Schools, 1850.	110,455	8,493
Native Free Population over 20 y's. of age, who are un- able to read or write, 1850..	5,272	16,908
That is.....	1 in 65	1 in 9
No. of Newspapers, 1850.....	58	9
Vols. in Public Libraries.....	107,943	420
Presidential Vote in 1852.....	82,939	19,577
Electors of President in 1856.	6	4
Representatives in Congress.	4	2
Voters entitled to choose one Representative to Congress	20,735	9,788
Value of Real and Personal Estate.....	\$59,787,255	\$39,841,025
Value to each free person.....	\$150	\$245
Annual Product of Mechan- ical Industry.....	\$10,979,894	\$607,436
Cash value of Farms.....	\$51,872,446	\$16,265,245
Value of Land, per acre.....	\$40	\$15
Value of Live Stock, 1850.....	\$8,008,734	\$6,647,969
Value of Animals Slaught- ered in 1850.....	\$1,328,327	\$1,163,313
Population employed in Ag- riculture.....	56,521	26,355
Population employed in Ma- nufactures.....	6,890	1,173
Miles of Railroad.....	590	37

Table IV.—Massachusetts and South Carolina.

	Massachu- setts.	South Carolina.
Incorporated into Union.....	1789	1789
Territory, square miles.....	7,250	25,000
Territory, acres.....	4,640,000	17,920,000
Pop. to the square mile, 1850	127 1/2	23 1/2
Population in 1790.....	378,717	249,073
Population in 1800.....	423,245	345,391
Population in 1810.....	472,040	415,115
Population in 1820.....	523,287	502,741
Population in 1830.....	610,408	581,185
Population in 1840.....	737,090	594,398
Population in 1850.....	994,514	668,507
Free White Pop., 1790.....	373,254	140,178
Free White Pop., 1800.....	416,793	196,255
Free White Pop., 1810.....	465,393	214,196
Free White Pop., 1820.....	516,419	257,440
Free White Pop., 1830.....	603,359	255,863
Free White Pop., 1840.....	720,030	259,084
Free White Pop., 1850.....	985,450	274,563
Slave Population, 1790.....	None	107,094
Slave Population, 1800.....	None	146,151
Slave Population, 1810.....	None	196,365
Slave Population, 1820.....	None	258,475
Slave Population, 1830.....	None	315,401
Slave Population, 1840.....	None	327,038
Slave Population, 1850.....	None	354,984
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1800	11.66	40.00
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1810	11.63	9.14
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1820	10.93	10.85
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1830	16.83	8.6
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1840	20.82	0.47
In. of white pop. pr. ct., 1850	35.17	5.87
No. of Church Sittings, 1850	692,323	460,450
Pupils in Pub. Schools, 1850	176,475	17,838
Native Free Population over 20 years of age, unable to read or write, 1850.....	1,861	16,460
That is.....	1 in 446	1 in 17
No. of Newspapers, 1850.....	209	19
Volumes in Public Libraries	684,015	107,472
Average vote.....	132,142	42,594
Electors of President, 1856...	13	8
Representatives in Congress	11	6
Voters entitled to choose one Representative to Congress	12,013	7149
Value of Real and Personal Estate.....	\$573,342,286	\$288,257,094
Do. to each free person.....	577	1,017
Annual Product of Mechan- ical Industry.....	1,517,145	9,728,438
Cash Value of Farms.....	109,076,347	82,431,684
Value of Land per acre.....	80	85
Value of Live Stock, 1850.....	9,647,710	15,060,015
Value of animals slaugh- tered, 1850.....	2,500,924	3,502,637
Population employed in Ag- riculture.....	87,837	198,363
Population employed in Ma- nufactures.....	85,176	10,326
Tonnage employed in Com- merce, 1851.....	32,415,327	2,081,312
Miles of Railroad.....	1,400	846
Miles of Canal.....	100	50



